

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL P HOLLINS, NO C-09-2028 VRW (PR)  
Plaintiff,  
v ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH LEAVE  
TO AMEND  
STARR A WILSON, Court Reporter,  
Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Petitioner, a federal prisoner incarcerated at the United States Penitentiary, Hazelton in West Virginia, has filed a pro se civil rights complaint under 42 USC section 1983 against Starr A Wilson, a court reporter for the federal district court, Northern District of California. Doc #1. Petitioner seems to be complaining about events that took place on November 27, 2007 when he appeared before the Honorable Saundra Brown Armstrong, Judge of the Northern District of California, for a supervised release revocation and disposition hearing in case No CR-92-00126-SBA. According to the court docket for that case, Starr A Wilson was the court reporter transcribing the proceedings. See case No CR-92-00126-SBA, Doc

1 #174. Plaintiff seeks damages.

2

3 I

4       Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of  
5 cases in which prisoners seek redress from a governmental entity or  
6 officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 USC § 1915A(a).  
7 The court must identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint,  
8 or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint "is frivolous,  
9 malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be  
10 granted," or "seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune  
11 from such relief." Id § 1915A(b). Pleadings filed by pro se  
12 litigants, however, must be liberally construed. Balistreri v  
13 Pacifica Police Dep't, 901 F2d 696, 699 (9th Cir 1990).

14       As noted above, plaintiff filed the instant action as a  
15 civil rights complaint under 42 USC section 1983. But because he  
16 names a federal employee as the sole defendant, the court construes  
17 the action as a claim under Bivens v Six Unknown Named Agents, 403  
18 US 388 (1971), and its progeny. To state a claim under Bivens,  
19 plaintiff must allege: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution  
20 or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged  
21 violation was committed by a federal actor. See West v Atkins, 487  
22 US 42, 48 (1988) (noting elements of 42 USC section 1983 actions);  
23 Van Strum v Lawn, 940 F2d 406, 409 (9th Cir 1991) (finding 42 USC  
24 section 1983 and Bivens actions identical save for replacement of  
25 state actor under section 1983 by federal actor under Bivens).

26       Plaintiff articulates his claim in its entirety as

27

28

1 follows:

2 On November 27, 2007, Starr A Wilson, Court  
3 Reporter for the United States District Court  
4 for the Northern District of California did  
5 knowingly, willfully and intentionally alter,  
6 change or modify court records by fabricating  
7 and or omitting testimony pertaining to a  
8 criminal case which constitutes a violation of  
9 the oath taken as a registered court reporter.

10 Doc #1 at 3.

11 Plaintiff's allegation that the court reporter's actions  
12 constituted a violation of her oath fails to state a claim upon  
13 which relief may be granted, because it does not implicate a right  
14 secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States. See Van  
15 Strum, 940 F2d at 409. District courts, however, must afford pro se  
16 prisoner litigants an opportunity to amend to correct any deficiency  
17 in their complaints. Lopez v Smith, 203 F3d 1122, 1126-27 (9th Cir  
18 2000) (en banc). Plaintiff will be afforded an opportunity to amend  
19 and allege, if possible, how the court reporter's actions deprived  
20 him of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United  
21 States.

22 II

23 Good cause appearing, the complaint is DISMISSED WITH  
24 LEAVE TO FILE AN AMENDED COMPLAINT within thirty days of the date of  
25 this order. The pleading must be simple and concise and must  
26 include the caption and civil case number used in this order and the  
27 words FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT on the first page. Failure to file a  
28 proper amended complaint within thirty days of this order will

1 result in the dismissal of this action.

2 Plaintiff is advised that the first amended complaint will  
3 supersede the original complaint and all other pleadings. Claims  
4 and defendants not included in the first amended complaint will not  
5 be considered by the court. See King v Atiyeh, 814 F2d 565, 567  
6 (9th Cir 1987).

7

8

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10

11



---

12 VAUGHN R WALKER  
13 United States District Chief Judge

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

G:\PRO-SE\VRW\CR.09\Hollins-09-2028-dwlta.wpd

27

28